

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15 are presently active, Claims 3, 8 and 13 having been previously canceled without prejudice, and Claims 1, 6 and 11 are amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Silva et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,976,210).

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome because, in Applicants' view, independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over Silva et al. as discussed below.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "extracting one or a plurality of partial documents from the first documents according to locations of the first documents on the Internet and ranges of the partial documents to be extracted, ***the locations of the first document and the ranges of the partial documents to be extracted*** described by the specific markup language and ***included in the second document***," "inserting the partial documents extracted by the extracting step into the second document to generate a document structure containing original document structures of the first and second documents according to insertion positions of the partial documents on the second document, ***the insertion positions*** described by the specific markup language and ***included in the second document***" and "converting semantically the document structure generated by the inserting step into a desired document structure according to ranges of the second document to be converted including the partial documents inserted by the inserting step and identification information of a file describing a conversion rule for converting the document structure into the desired document structure, ***the ranges of the***

second document to be converted and the identification information described by the specific markup language and *included in the second document.*”

That is, the locations of the first documents, the ranges of the partial documents to be extracted, the insertion positions, the ranges of the second document to be converted, and the identification information of a file describing a conversion rule are included in the second document to be converted.

The Advisory Action dated October 13, 2006 asserts that Silva et al. discloses using at least a tag or specifying the ranges for which the document structure of the second document is to be converted and describing the identification information of the file describing the conversion rule. Applicants respectfully submit that even if Silva et al. describes using at least a tag or specifying the ranges for which the document structure of the second document is to be converted and describing the identification information of the file describing the conversion rule, Silva et al. does not disclose that the locations of the first documents, the ranges of the partial documents to be extracted, the insertion positions, the ranges of the second document to be converted, and the identification information of a file describing a conversion rule are described in the second document to be converted.

Silva et al. describes, at column 7, lines 47-52, “Note that since many HTML pages are not well-formed, there may be missing tags, tags for different elements may overlap, etc., the parser must correct such page anomalies. Thus a parser 210 generates an equivalent well-formed version of the source Web page from which a clipping is to be extracted.” Silva et al. shows that the parser 210 to correct page anomalies (missing tags, tags for different elements may overlap, etc.) is included in the web clipping manager 202 (Silva et al., Fig. 2). Namely, what Silva et al. describes is merely that the parser 210 in the web clipping manager 202 corrects page anomalies. Silva et al. does not disclose that the locations of the HTML files, the ranges of the partial documents to be extracted, the insertion positions, the ranges of the

HTML files to be converted, and the identification information of a file describing a conversion rule are described in the HTML files to be converted.

Thus, Silva et al. fails to teach or suggest "... *the locations of the first document and the ranges of the partial documents to be extracted ... included in the second document,*" "... *the insertion positions ... included in the second document*" and "... *the ranges of the second document to be converted and the identification information ... included in the second document,*" as recited in Claim 1.

Similar arguments set forth above apply to Claims 6 and 11.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over Silva et al. Therefore, Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the pending Claims 2, 4-5, 7, 9-10, 12 and 14-15 dependent from Claims 1, 6 and 11 are believed to be allowable.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, it is believed that the outstanding rejection is overcome, and the application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

EHK\TY:pta

I:\ATTY\TYAMEND-RESPONSES\217398\217398 PROPOSED RESPONSE DUE NOV 13 2006 WITH TWO MONTH EXTENSION.DOC